

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of this response. Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application; claims 1, 14, 15 and 19 have been amended and claims 1, 14, 15, and 19 are independent claims.

### ***COMMENTS ON PERSONAL INTERVIEW***

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his valuable time in conducting a personal interview with Applicant's Representative on June 28, 2005. During said interview, Applicant's set forth arguments regarding the Examiner's alleged motivation for combining Tietzel and Kelley under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). More specifically, Applicant submits that Tietzel and Kelley are directed to two different technology areas and, thus, are not from the, "same field of endeavor," as alleged by the Examiner. However, the Examiner respectfully disagreed. Furthermore, during said interview, Applicant also traversed the Examiner's alleged reliance on column 10, line 62 – column 11, line 19 (of Kelley) for allegedly providing motivation for combining the teachings of Tietzel with the teachings of Kelley. More specifically, Applicant submits that while the cited portions of Kelley arguably disclose advantages produced by the system of Kelley, these advantages are specific to computer graphic systems and the generating of interpolated parameter values for pixels as discussed in Kelley. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these advantages would not be achieved by modifying the disclosure of Tietzel with the disclosure of Kelley, let alone, would it have been obvious to modify the teachings of Tietzel with the teachings of Kelley to achieve these advantages; especially at the time the invention was made. However, again, the Examiner disagreed.

Further still, during the personal interview, possible minor clarifying amendments to

currently pending independent claims 1, 14, 15 and 19 were discussed. More specifically, the Examiner indicated a minor clarifying amendment indicating that the, "writing fields," include, "at least a portion of a writing swath," would be sufficient to overcome the outstanding rejection in view of Tietzel and Kelley.

### **PRIOR ART REJECTIONS**

#### *Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)*

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Teitzel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,533,170, hereinafter referred to as "Teitzel") in view of Kelley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,701,405, hereinafter referred to as "Kelley"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, especially in view of claims 1, 14 and 15 as now amended.

As discussed above, at the conclusion of the June 28, 2005 personal interview, the Examiner indicated that Tietzel and Kelley neither alone nor in combination teach or suggest at least, "writing fields including at least a portion of a writing swath," as now set forth in claim 1 and somewhat similarly in claims 14 and 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 14 and 15 are in condition for allowance.

Further, Applicant submits that claims 2-13 and 16-18 are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 14 or 15.

#### *Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)*

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Tietzel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,533,170, hereinafter referred to as "Tietzel"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, especially in view of claim 19 as now amended.

As discussed above, at the conclusion of the June 28, 2005 personal interview, the Examiner indicated that Tietzel fails to teach or suggest at least, "writing fields including at least a portion of a writing swath," as now set forth in claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is in condition for allowance.

### ***CONCLUSION***


Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-19 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application; the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094  
P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

JAC/AMW:jcp